

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 10-16, 20-26, and 28-31 are now in the application. Claims 1, 10, 20, 21, 23 and 26 have been amended. Claims 5-9, 17-19, 27 and 32 have been canceled without prejudice and applicant reserves the right to file the claims in a continuation application. The specification has been amended to correct clerical errors. Some figures have been amended as required by the examiner to provide labels to facilitate an understanding of the figures.

Before discussing the claims, it may be helpful to review differences between the claimed invention and the prior art cited by the examiner. The invention is directed to generating information screens and control screens that are full screen displays. Both of these screens may be full screen displays as a composite screen -- transparent screens superimposed on each other. Thus, each screen is a full screen display and fully visible to the user. Depending on the blending of the screens, the information screen may appear to be in the foreground or the control screen may appear to be in the foreground. In either event the entire screen for the information screen and the control screen are visible to the user.

In contrast, the Capps reference and all the other cited references are using a conventional technique where a portion of the display is consumed by each of the information screen and the control screen. Neither the information screen or the control screen have full use of the complete display. Whichever screen is in the foreground, the background screen is not visible through the foreground screen.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Of the claims now in the application, claims 1-4, 10-16, 26, and 28-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Capps et al. (USPN 6,512,525).

Independent claim 1 is directed to displaying an information screen using a first transparency mask and to superimposing at least one control image using a second transparency mask so that the display background appears behind the display foreground. The Capps reference does not use a transparency mask and does not superimpose two screens using transparency masks. Accordingly, claim 1 should be allowed. Claims 2, 3, and 4 are dependent on claim 1 and should be allowed for the same reasons as discussed above for claim 1.

Claim 10 is directed to generating a transparent information screen and a transparent control screen, and combining these screens so that together they appear in a watermark fashion. In the Capps patent, the screens are not transparent and do not appear together in a watermark fashion when combined. Claim 10 should be allowed. Claims 11-16 depend from claim 10 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as claim 10.

Claims 26 and 28-31 now depend from claim 20 and are allowable for the same reasons as will be discussed below for claim 20.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Of the claims now in the application, claims 20-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Capps et al. and Menendez et al. (USPN 5,555,369).

Claim 20 is directed to generating with an alpha channel an information screen and generating with an alpha channel a control screen and, further, to alpha blending the information screen and the control screen into a composite screen whereby both the information screen and control screen appear as full screens. The Capps reference and the Menendez reference, either separately or in combination, do not describe using alpha channels with the information screen and the control screen and blending the screens into a composite screen. Claim 20 should be allowed.

Claims 21 and 23 have been amended to be consistent with the amended language in claim 20. Claim 26, previously an independent claim, has been amended to be dependent from claim 20. Claims 21-26 and 28-31 all now depend from claim 20 and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as discussed above for claim 20.

As all claims now in the application are in condition for allowance, Applicant requests the application be allowed and pass to issuance as soon as possible.


It is believed that no further fees are due with this Response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment with respect to this patent application to deposit account number 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date:

4/8/04



Homer L. Knearl

Reg. No. 21,197

27488

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE